

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 6, 8 and 11 - 15 as obvious over Mullaney and Evanitsky et al., rejected claims 2 and 7 as obvious over Mullaney, Evanitsky and Daly et al., rejected claim 4 and 9 as obvious over Mullaney, Evanitsky and Frary, rejected claims 5 and 10 as obvious over Mullaney, Evanitsky and Kumano.

The claims have been amended to claim a graphics file instead of a graphics bitmap, since the scope of the invention is broad enough to encompass not only raster graphics but also other forms of graphic elements as well.

35 USC §103(a)

The Examiner is basing the rejection on the combination of Mullaney and Evanitsky, as a base combination, and is adding three further references to reject a few of the dependent claims. The base combination of Mullaney and Evanitsky does many of the individual features of the claims, but these features are not used or presented the same way as in the present invention. Evanitsky shows a printer control with icons and associated text. Mullaney shows a display with an icon and text that may be changed to a different language. The language files are stored separately and unused language files can even be deleted from the storage area. The user may select which language is to be displayed from several available.

A difference of the invention over the prior art combination is that the combination does not show a symbol associated with the printer function that has a text describing the function that can be changed by a user. In Evanitsky, the text associated with the printer operating icons is not changeable by the user and are not separable from the symbol. In Mullaney, the logo on the display does not relate to a function described in the text.

The claims have been directed to text and symbols that both relate to the same printer function and yet are separate so that the user can change the text and replace it with a translation of that text into another language. This provides advantages over the prior art that are not available from the prior art references, whether considered individually or in

combination. This aspect of the invention is not taught or even suggested in the art, and so represents a non-obvious and therefore patentable improvement over the art.

Applicant has amended the claims to further highlight the differences between the invention and the references. In claim 1, only one instance of each graphic file is provided while multiple instances of the corresponding text is provided. The text and graphics are separate when stored, yet are combined in a display field when displayed. The displayed text and graphics of each display field relate to the corresponding function of that display field. The text is in the language that was selected.

Claims 6 and 15 have also been amended to claim non-obvious features.

Neither the Daly reference, Frary reference nor Kumano reference provides a teaching or suggestion of the claimed combination. As such, even when considered in combination as suggested by the Examiner, the invention as defined in the claims is non-obvious thereover.

The present invention as claimed is thus not shown or suggested in the prior art, and therefore is a non-obvious improvement thereover.

Conclusion

The claims have been amended to claim the features which distinguish the invention over the cited art. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,



Melvin A. Robinson (Reg. No. 31,870)

Schiff Hardin LLP

Patent Department

6600 Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606

Telephone: 312-258-5785

CUSTOMER NO. 26574

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT